



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The judgment of the circuit court, sustaining the demurrer to the evidence, is without error, and must be affirmed.

Affirmed.

**Note.**

The hopeless conflict between the decisions in this state as to the degree of care due licensees and trespassers by railroad companies, is pointed out by Robert W. Withers in a learned article in 12 Va. Law Reg. 419. The principal case recognizes in terms a distinction between the duty owing to trespassers and bare licensees, which Mr. Withers says was the doctrine of former decisions in Virginia.

---

**DIGEST OF OTHER RECENT VIRGINIA DECISIONS.**

**Supreme Court of Appeals.**

Note.—In this department we give the syllabus of every case decided by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, except of such cases as are reported in full.

---

**N. M. MATTHEWS & CO. v. PROGRESS DISTILLING CO.**

Nov. 19, 1908.

[62 S. E. 924.]

**Appeal and Error (§ 1195\*)—Time of Taking Proceedings—Finality of Decision.**—Proceedings were instituted by creditors to ascertain the liens against their common debtor, the order of their priority, and to subject his property to their payment. An exception was filed to the report of the commissioner which was sustained by the court, and an appeal taken. The Supreme Court reversed the decree of the lower court, and pronounced the decree which should have been pronounced below, and the case was remanded for further proceedings. Held, that the decision of the Supreme Court was final and imparted finality to the decision of the court below on the expiration of the period within which under the rules of the Supreme Court a petition to rehear could be filed, and a petition to review the judgment of the lower court must be brought within one year after the allowance of the final decree as provided by Code 1904, § 3435.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Appeal and Error, Dec. Dig. § 1195.\*]

---

\*For other cases see same topic and section NUMBER in Dec. and Am. Digs. 1907 to date. and Reporter Indexes.